

Senate. Instead, the White House Counsel's Office insists on substituting its judgment for the Senate's and tells the Senate that we already have sufficient information about this nominee.

We on this side of the aisle are making the simple request that judicial nominees for these lifetime positions fully and forthrightly answer legitimate questions so the Senate can make informed decisions. Even more important than this or any other nomination itself is the straightforward principle that no nominee should be rewarded with a lifetime appointment to the second highest court in the land for stonewalling the Senate and the American people. Getting a lifetime post on the Federal courts is a privilege, not a right.

I have voted for many, many judges whose judicial philosophy I disagreed with, but at least I knew what their judicial philosophies were. In fact the Democratic Senate confirmed 100 of President Bush's judicial nominees by the end of last year, and I voted for nearly all of them. The same can be said for each and every Senator on this side of the aisle.

I hope that after getting this letter off its chest, the administration will now begin to work with us. If they did we could end the stalemate they have created.

Those of us who want to resolve this in a way that upholds the principle of the Senate being able to make an informed judgment on this and on any judicial nominees welcomed the constructive discussion on the floor yesterday that Senator BENNETT initiated, about the potential for reaching agreement on making the Justice Department documents available to the Senate. I hope this is a signal that there is at least a chance that the administration will yet comply with our request, so that this standoff can be resolved.

With the White House, the House and the Senate now all controlled by one party, we are already seeing an erosion of accountability. Democratic members of the Senate are standing up for the Senate's constitutional role in the installation of judges on the Federal courts.

Beyond the difficulties we have encountered in obtaining straightforward answers from Mr. Estrada and in obtaining his work documents, in recent weeks the overall process of evaluating judicial candidates has begun to resemble a conveyor belt for rubber stamping nominees. The conveyor belt has been going faster and faster—so fast that the nominations have begun piling up at the end of the belt. We should be trying to minimize and not maximize those kinds of "I Love Lucy" moments. We have had an unprecedented hearing in which not one but three controversial circuit court nominees were considered, en bloc.

In the 107th Congress, the Democratic Senate confirmed 100 of President Bush's nominees, and we did so in an orderly process and with a steady

pace of hearings every single month that greatly improved on the slow and halting pace set by the previous Republican Senate in the handling of President Clinton's judicial nominees. The choice does not have to be between the slow pace of the earlier Republican Senate in the handling of President Clinton's nominees and the frenetic pace of the new Republican Senate in the handling of President Bush's nominees. We can and should find a responsible pace somewhere between those extremes.

The court to which Mr. Estrada has been nominated, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, has been called the second most powerful court in the land, and for good reason. This court, in particular, affects every single American in many ways, in its decisions on everything from clean air and water issues to the voting rights of Latinos and other minorities to the health and employment rights of working men and women.

No circuit court in the Nation is more important to Hispanic Americans than the DC Circuit. I commend the Congressional Hispanic Caucus for the time, the effort its members have invested and the courage its members have shown in closely examining the record, in interviewing Mr. Estrada, and in offering its judgment about the importance of this nomination for the interests of Hispanic Americans everywhere.

What kind of cases does this court handle, and what is at stake in the decisions it renders? There is a big hint in a front page story that ran a few days ago in Roll Call, in which leaders on the other side of the aisle are reminding lobbyists for big business groups that they have a major stake in who gets on this crucial circuit court.

This process starts with the President. With a simple directive to the Justice Department, he can help the Senate resolve this. I was encouraged early in his term when the President said he wanted to be a uniter and not a divider. Yet he has sent several judicial nominations, selected foremost for their ideology, and not for their fairness, that have divided the American people and divided the Senate. And in terms of fairness, it also needs to be pointed out that the Republican Senate blocked President Clinton's nominees to this very same court.

What are we asking for? It is a simple request: We ask only for sufficient answers and information so that the Senate can make informed decisions about candidates for lifetime appointments to the Federal judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The minority whip.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senator STEVENS had asked some time ago if we could move things along. The Senator from Iowa has agreed to allow the Senator from Minnesota, who has been waiting here a long time, to give a speech on a subject, I believe it is Iraq. And he originally wanted to speak for 20 minutes. I asked him if he would speak for 10, and he has graciously consented to do that. It is my understanding the Senator from Arizona wishes to speak.

I ask unanimous consent that following the Senator from Minnesota speaking for 10 minutes, the Senator from Arizona be recognized for a period not to exceed—how much time?

Mr. MCCAIN. One hour.

Mr. REID. One hour. I ask unanimous consent that be the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. Actually, I object. I will not take a time agreement at this time. I will agree. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. REID. I say, before the Chair enters that, if the Senator from Arizona needs more time, we will certainly arrange that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Nevada for this agreement. And I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, and Senator MCCAIN also for graciously granting me this opportunity.

IRAQ

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, the Senate has been dealing with some important matters these days, with a judicial nomination to the second highest court in the country, and shortly to bring up an appropriations bill that will determine spending across this country with hundreds of billions of dollars for the rest of this fiscal year.

But there is something else going on in this country which is of overwhelming importance which really should supersede all of this, and that is the imminent prospect of a war against Iraq.

At the same time we are talking about these other matters, this country is under a condition code orange, the second highest level of security we have. Our citizens have been told in the last few days to go out and get duct tape and sheets of plastic and water.

Today at the Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, of which I am a member, the Secretary of Defense called the time that we are in now "the most dangerous security environment that the world has ever known." It is for those reasons I wrote the majority leader and urged we not take a recess as planned next week, that we stay in